

دانشگاه سمنان

دانشكده علوم انسانى

گروه زبان و ادبیات انگلیسی

پایان نامه کارشناسی ارشد رشته آموزش زبان انگلیسی

عنوان:

مطالعه ی قیاسی کلاس های خودگردان و غیر خودگردان در کاربرد استراتژی های مکالمه توسط زبان آموزان

استاد راهنما:

دكتر عباس مرادان

استاد مشاور:

دكتر آرام رضا صادقى

دانشجو:

منير جعفرى

به نام خدا

کلیه حقوق مادی و معنوی مترتب برنتایج مطا لعات ،

ابتکارات و نوآوری های ناشی از تحقیق موضوع

این پایان نامه (رساله) متعلق به دانشگاه سمنان است.

اینجانب منیر جعفری دانشجوی دوره کارشناسی ارشد رشته آموزش زبان انگلیسی دانشکده علوم انسانی دانشگاه سمنان گواهی مینمایم که تحقیقات ارائه شده در این پایان نامه توسط اینجانب انجام شده و صحت و امانت مطالت نگارش شده مورد تائید میباشد و لذا مورد استفاده از کار دیگر محققان به مرجع مورد استفاده اشاره شده است. بعلاوه گواهی می نمایم که مطالب مندرج در پایان نامه تا کنون برای دریافت هیچ مدرکی یا امتیازی توسط اینجانب یا فرد دیگری در هیچ جا ارائه نشده است و در تدوین متن پایان نامه چارچوب (فرمت) مصوب دانشگاه را به طور کامل ر عایت کرده ام.

هدف از انجام این پایان نامه، بررسی و مقایسه کاربرد استراتژی های مکالمه توسط زبان آموزان در کلاس های خودگردان و غیر خودگردان می باشد.گروه خودگردان بر اساس تعریف عمل می کنند. برای این منظور، زبان تعریف شده است که زبان آموزان با نظارت مدرس، مستقل عمل می کنند. برای این منظور، زبان آموزان سطح Advanceر آزمون pre-test و pre-test شدند تا عملکرد آن ها در دو گروه قابل مقایسه باشد.زبان آموزان در دو گروه خودگردان و غیر خودگردان مورد مطالعه قرار گرفتند. نتایج مطالعه نشان داد که گروه خودگردان به طور قابل ملاحظه ای نسبت به گروه غیر خودگردان،بیشتر از استراتژی ها استفاده می کند.



Semnan University

Department Of Teaching English As A Foreign Language

Master Thesis

A Comparative Study Between Autonomous and Non-autonomous EFL Classes on Their Use of Communicative Strategies.

Thesis Supervisor:

Dr. Abbas. Moradan

Thesis Advisor:

Dr. Aramreza Sadeghy

By

Moneer Jafari

December2012

Semnan University
Department of Foreign Languages
December 2012
WE HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THIS THESIS
BY Moneer Jafari
ENTITLED A comparative study between autonomous
and non-autonomous EFL classes on their
use of communicative strategies.
BE ACCEPTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF M.A. IN TEACHING
ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE.
COMMITTEE ON ORAL EXAMINATION:
(Superviser)
(Adviser) Dr. A. R. Sadeghy
Dr. Rouyanian (Head of the Department of Foreign Languages)

In the Name of God

the Beneficent,

the Merciful

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My heartfelt thank goes to *Dr. Moradan* who helped me with his supervision in this study. He was of abundant help and inspiration during the different stages of doing the research and provided me with invaluable sources to complete the study. Equally, I would also like to express my gratitude to *Dr. Sadeghi*, the honorable advisor, who provided me with encouragement to do the study.

Moreover, I owe a great deal to *Dr. Golhosseini* for his kind cooperation in all stages of this study, especially the statistical analysis of the research.

Also, I gratefully thank *Dr. Farjami* for his real assistance and encouragment during M.A course.

My sincere thank is devoted to my *mother*, *father* and *sister* for their help and encouragements throughout the process of this research.

ABSTRACT

This thesis studies EFL learners' use of communicative strategies in autonomous and non-autonomous classes. For this purpose, the researcher decided to perform the study on advanced EFL learners in an English language institute. There were 80 advanced learners that 39 of them participated in group A and 41 took part in group B. Group A was chosen to be autonomous and group B was decided to be non-autonomous by tossing a coin. Autonomous group was divided to 2 classes and non-autonomous group was divided to 3 classes. In autonomous classes, the learners were assigned to different groups.

A discussion course was held in two months while autonomous classes as the experimental group received the treatment. After the course, the oral proficiency test was administered as a post-test to compare both groups' oral proficiency level with each other and also with their pre-test; moreover, learners' use of different communicative strategies was studied in both groups in order to see if there is any difference between them.

The result of T-test showed that there was significant difference between autonomous and non-autonomous groups in their use of communicative strategies. EFL learners in autonomous group used communicative strategies more than the learners in non-autonomous group; moreover, learners' oral proficiency level was higher in autonomous group after the treatment, so it can be concluded that autonomy can improve learner's oral ability since it persuades learners to use communicative strategies and apply them in their oral activities.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	KNOWLEDGMENTSi
AB	STRACTii
TA]	BLE OF CONTENTSiv
TA]	BLE OF TABLESix
TA	BLE OF FIGURESx
CH	APTER I: Introduction
1.1.	Introduction2
1.2.	Statement of the Problem8
1.3.	Design11
1.4.	Research Question
1.5.	Research Hypotheses
1.6.	Significance of the Study12
1.7.	Definition of Important Terms13
	1.7.1. Strategy13
	1.7.2. Communication Strategies
	1.7.3. Autonomy14
1.8.	Summary14
СН	APTER II: Literature Review
2.1	Introduction16
2.2	The Theoretical Background of The Learning Strategies in Second Language
	Acquisition16
2.3	Learning Strategies24
2.4	Strategy Description25

2.5	Comn	nunicative Competence	26
	2.5.1.	Components of Communicative Competence	27
2.6	Identi	fication of Communication Strategies	29
2.7	Comn	nunicative Strategies Definition	31
2.8	Typol	ogies in Communication Strategy Studies	33
	2.8.1	Tarone	33
	2.8.2	Faerch & Kasper	36
	2.8.3	Bialystok & Frohlich	37
	2.8.4	Chen Si-Qing	39
2.9	Expe	erimental Works on the Relationship Between Languages Proficiency	and
	the U	Jse of Communication Strategy	40
	2.9.1.	Bialystok & Frohlich	40
	2.9.2.	Paribakht	41
	2.9.3.	Bongaert & Kellerman & Bentlage	42
	2.9.4.	Poulisse	43
	2.9.5.	Poulisse & Schils	44
	2.9.6.	Chen Si-Qing	44
2.10) Defin	ition of Learner Autonomy	45
2.1	l A Bri	ef History of Learner Autonomy	48
	2.11.1	Origins of Learner Autonomy in Foreign Language Learning	48
	2.11.2	. Background of Learner Autonomy in SLA	50
		2.11.2.1. Philosophical Background	50
		2.11.2. 2. Pedagogical Background	51
2.12	2 Appı	roaches to Learner Autonomy	54
2.13	3 Lear	ning Strategies and Autonomy	58

2.14 Curriculum in Learner Autonomy61
2.14.1 Course Content62
2.14.2 Selecting Materials64
2.14.3 Discipline Matters66
2.14.4 Record Keeping66
2.15 Lesson Methodology in Learner Autonomy68
2.15.1. Individual, Pair, and Group Work69
2.15.2. Use of Materials71
2.16 Teacher Role in Learner Autonomy72
2.17 Learner Role in Learner Autonomy73
2.18 Summary76
CHAPTER III: Method
3.1 Introduction78
3.1 Introduction
3.2 Participants
3.2 Participants 78 3.3 Instrument 80 3.3.1 Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) 80 3.3.2 Observing and Audio Recording 82 3.3.3 Checklist 84 3.4 Procedure 87
3.2 Participants
3.2 Participants
3.2 Participants

	•••••	••••••	••••••	••••••	•••••	•••••	••••••	•••••	96
4.3	Communic	cative	Strategies	Which	Cause	Significan	t Diffe	rence	between
	Autonomo	ous	ar	nd	No	n-autonomo	ous		Groups
	•••••	••••••	•••••	••••••	•••••	••••••	••••••	•••••	10
	0								
4.4	The Use					egies Be			
		1	••••••••••	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	••••••	••••••	••••••	•••••••••	10
4.5	Autonomo					oups' Ora			
		2		•	•••••	•	•••••••	••••••	10
4.6	Male and		ale's Or	al Profi	ciency	Level in	Autono	omous	Group
		•••••	••••••	••••••	•••••	•••••	••••••	••••••	1
		03							
4.7	Male and	Female ⁵	s Use of (Communic	cative St	rategies in	Autonoi	mous G	roup
		•••••	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•••••	•••••	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•••••	•••••	1
		05							
СН	APTER V:	Discus	sion and (Conclusio	n				
5.1	Introducti	on							
		•••••	••••••	••••••	••••••	••••••	•••••	••••••	10
		8							
5.2	Findings								
	•••	••••••	•••••	••••••	•••••	••••••	••••••	•••••	10

	5.2.1	Comparing Communicative Strategies Between Autonomous and Non-
		autonomous Classes
		108
	5.2.2	Communicative Strategies Which Were Used More in Autonomous
		Class
		109
	5.2.3	Communicative Strategies Which Were Used More in Non-
		Autonomous Class
		109
	5.2.4	Learners' Oral Proficiency Level in Autonomous and Non-Autonomous
		Group 109
	5.2.5	Comparing Males and Females on Their Use of Communicative
		Strategies
		110
	5.2.6	Comparing Male and Female Oral Proficiency Level in Autonomous
		Group
		110
	5.2.7	Comparing Male and Females' Use of Communicative Strategies in
		Autonomous Group
		111
5.3	Discus	ssion
		11
		2
5.4	Concl	usion

		•••••	••••••	••••••	11
		6			
5.5	Pedagogica	ıl			Implication
		•••••	••••••		11
		6			
5.6	Suggestion		for	Further	Studies
		•••••	••••••		11
		7			
5.7	Limitation		of	the	Study
		•••••	••••••		11
		8			
5.8	Final				Remarks
		•••••	••••••		11
		8			
RE	FERENCES	S	••••••		119
AP]	PENDICES	• • • • • • • • •	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•••••	128

TABLE OF TABLES

Table 3.1. Test of homogeneity of variances of autonomous and non-autonomous groups' level in pre-test79	
Table3.2. Penny Ur's scale for OPI81	
Table4.1. The age of participants93	
Table4.2. The age of participants in autonomous group94	
Table4.3. The age of participants in non-autonomous group94	
Table4.4. Autonomous and non-autonomous groups' oral proficiency level in pre- test	
Table4.5.The use of communicative strategies in autonomous and non-autonomous groups	
Table 4.6. The use of communicative strategies between two sexes101	
Table4.7.Autonomous and non-autonomous oral proficiency level in post-test 103	
Table4.8. Autonomous group's male and female's oral proficiency level in post-test	104
Table4.9. Autonomous group's male and female's oral proficiency level in pre-test	104
Table4.10.The use of communicative strategies by male and female in Autonomous group	
10	

TABLE OF FIGURES

Figure4.1.Autonomous strategies		non-autonomous	0 1				
98	•••••					•	
Figure4.2. Autonomous	and 1	non-autonomous g	roups' ora	al pro	fici	ency level before	and
after the treatment		•••••	• • • • • • • • • • • •	• • • • • •	• • • • •	•••••	105

CHAPTER I Introduction

1.1. Introduction

For a long time, English teaching has been dominated by a teacher-centered and book-centered approach. Such a teacher-centered method would result in students' strong reliance on teachers in English learning. It is teachers that tell students what to do and students just listen and obey. Undoubtedly, this passive way of learning English would not lead to learn and use English effectively.

On the other hand, learning strategies can enable students to become more Independent and autonomous learners (Little, 1991). Despite this potential value of being able to communicate effectively in English learning, the number of related investigations has been remained small. Actually many studies have been conducted recently on the relationship between teaching learning strategies and language performance but not specifically on different types of communicative strategy; moreover, these studies do not take into account the importance of learner-centered classroom in enhancing learners' ability to use strategies.

The current study concentrates on the use of different types of communicative strategies in autonomous class which will go on by students themselves in comparison with teacher-centered class.

There has been a great deal of second language acquisition researches since 1980s, most of which have focused on individual differences in language learning, and learner-centered Second Language Acquisition (Skehan, 1989, Bayer, 1990, Nyikos & Oxford, 1993 and Wen & Johnson, 1997).

The literature on learning strategies in SLA emerged from a concern for identifying the characteristics of effective learners (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990). Researchers in the area of SLA focused on learning strategies as the main characteristics of successful SL learners. Initially, the assumption was that if learning strategies of good language learners are identified and taught to less competent learners, it will have considerable potentials for enhancing the development of SL skills (O'Malley et al, 1985). Research on language learning strategies began with the works of Rubin (1987) who tried to figure out the characteristics of successful language learners. They maintain that *the good language learner* is a willing and accurate guesser, has a strong inner drive to communicate with others, is often uninhibited in the interaction s/he engages in, focuses on both form and function, practices, monitors her/his own speech and pays attention to meaning.